

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wopto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/799,417	03/12/2004	Paul A. Krieg	20825-0004	6904	
7550 0223/2010 Kathryn H. Wade, Ph.D. SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN LLP			EXAM	EXAMINER	
			BRISTOL, LYNN ANNE		
999 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30309-3996		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			1643		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/23/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/799,417	KRIEG, PAUL A.			
Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	LYNN BRISTOL	1643			
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>final</u>					
(1) <u>LYNN BRISTOL</u> .	(3) Alan Robins.				
(2) Wm Warren.	(4)				
Date of Interview: 19 February 2010	Time: 9:30 AM				
Type of Interview:  ⊠ Telephonic  □ Video Conference  □ Personal (Copy given to: □ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: □ Yes  If Yes, provide a brief description:					
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed: 112, 1 <sup>st</sup> enablement and written description; ODP					
Claims discussed: 1-13, 21-26 and 28-30					
Prior art documents discussed: not applicable					
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet					
Part III.					
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>					
/Lynn Bristol/ Primary Examiner					
(A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)			

Application No. 10/799,417

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner will drop ODP rejection in view of abandoned conflicting application; discussed draft claim 1 frow 1/170 vis-à-vis scope for in vitro and in vivo method and where no support for functionalized antibody for instant Claims 2-4; unclear what epitope is for ab208 and abz 10 so unclear if antibody binds peptides of SEQ ID NOS: 1, 2, 3 and 5 of claims 8-11 and 12; language for "biological sample" wit practicing the method in vivo in a patient is ackward and could be amended to clarify an in vitro method from an in vivo method in a patient having the angiogensis-related disorder andin need thereof.